Amendments to the Drawings:

Attached hereto is a replacement drawing sheet of Fig. 25. Fig. 25 has been labeled as --PRIOR ART--.

Attachment: Replacement drawing sheet of Fig. 25

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 are pending herein. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended as supported by Fig. 1 of the present application, for example. Claim 10 has been amended as supported by Fig. 17 of the present application, for example.

1. The objections to the specification relating to the disclosure of JP 2000-291653 is noted, but deemed moot in view of the Information Disclosure Statement filed herewith.

2. The objection to the drawings is noted, but deemed moot in view of amended Fig. 25, filed herewith.

3. The rejection of claim 1 under §112, second paragraph is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above. Applicants respectfully submit that the term "thin" has been defined within the claim to describe a length which is at least three times a thickness. Such a definition is supported by the figures of the present application.

4. The rejection of claim 4 under §112, second paragraph is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above. Applicants respectfully submit that the term "precision" has been deleted from claim 4 as the term "precision" is unnecessary to define the use of sheet steel in the manufacture of a rolling guide apparatus, as shown in Fig. 1 of the present application.

5. The rejection of claim 10 under §112, second paragraph is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above. Applicants respectfully submit that an advantageous use of the present invention includes a combination of two rolling guide apparatuses such that movement is allowed along two vertically opposite directions, as is shown in Fig. 17 of the present application. Claim 10 further limits

the arrangement of two rolling guide apparatuses by reciting that the upper and lower track rails are fixedly secured to centers of mounting plates, respectively, with end portions of the mounting plates being fixedly attached to counterpart mounting surfaces.

6. Claims 1 and 3-7 were rejected under §102(b) over Teramachi. To the extent that this rejection may be applied against the amended claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a rolling guide apparatus comprising a track rail comprising a thin central plate portion with first and second ends, first and second rolling member contact plates projecting outwardly from the second end, and first and second fixed plates projecting outwardly from the first end. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the thin central plate portion has a length which is at least three times a thickness of the thin central plate portion and which is elastically deformable between the first and second ends by forces placed on the rolling member contact plates and the fixed plates.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rolling guide apparatus, as recited in claim 1, includes a thin central plate portion extending vertically, which is advantageously elastically deformable in a lateral direction. The thin central plate portion, recited as having a length which is at least three times a thickness, allows for elastic deformations to occur because of mounting irregularities, inadvertent bending of the mounting surface in use, etc. without failure or fatigue of the central plate portion. The elastic deformation allowed by the thin central plate portion allows the rolling guide apparatus to be mounted and used on surfaces which are expected to flex, such as an automobile chassis, an aircraft frame, sail, etc. Traditional rolling guide apparatuses, like the versions discussed below, have a thick central plate

portion, which requires that they be mounted to a flat, rigid structure such as a machine frame.

Teramachi discloses, in Fig. 1, a traditional rolling guide apparatus having a thick central plate portion 5, which due to its thick proportions, would be highly resistant to any sort of elastic deflection. Teramachi discloses in column 3, lines 13-15, that the rolling guide apparatus has a high rigidity and improved automatic aligning performance. In column 3, lines 31-43, Teramachi discloses that impact loads are absorbed through elastic deformation of the extended portions of the rail body, not the central plate portion. Teramachi does not disclose or suggest a non-rigid thin central plate portion. Accordingly, the rolling guide apparatus of Teramachi will fail to function in applications where deflection is common place, such as in an aircraft or automobile body. Therefore, Teramachi at least fails to disclose a rolling guide apparatus comprising a track rail comprising a thin central plate portion having a length which is at least three times a thickness of the thin central plate portion, and which is elastically deformable, as recited in claim 1. Since claims 3-7 depend directly from claim 1, those claims are also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

7. Claims 1, 3 and 6-8 were rejected under §102(b) over Michioka. To the extent that this rejection may be applied against the amended claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Michioka discloses, in Fig. 3, a traditional rolling guide apparatus having a rigid thick central plate portion. The central plate portion of Michioka has little, if any, additional height over its width. Such a central plate portion is very resistant to any elastic deformation in a lateral direction. In fact, Michioka discloses, in Fig. 1, that different prefabricated track pieces 1b, 1a are required to account for any lateral

deformations required for operation. Michioka does not disclose or suggest a non-rigid thin plate portion allowing for even slight deformations. Therefore, Michioka fails to disclose a rolling guide apparatus comprising a track rail comprising a thin central plate portion that has a length which is at least three times a thickness of the thin central plate portion and which is elastically deformable, as recited in claim 1. Since claims 3 and 6-8 depend directly from claim 1, those claims are also believed to be allowable over the applied art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

8. Claim 2 was rejected under §103(a) over Teramachi in view of Willard. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Teramachi. Since Willard does not overcome the deficiencies of Teramachi, and since claim 2 depends directly from claim 1, claim 2 is also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.

9. Claim 9 was rejected under §103(a) over Teramachi in view of Chen. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Teramachi. Since Chen does not overcome the deficiencies of Teramachi, and since claim 9 depends indirectly from claim 1, claim 9 is also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.

10. Claim 10 was rejected under §103(a) over Teramachi in view of Yamagisawa. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Teramachi. Since Yamagisawa does not overcome the deficiencies of Teramachi, and since claim 10 depends indirectly from claim 1, claim 10 is also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims herein define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for this application in due course.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to confirm receipt and consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement and Revocation of Power of Attorney filed herewith.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicant's attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

July 20, 2006
Date

Stephen P. Burr
Reg. No. 32,970

Timothy D. Evans
Reg. No. 50,797

SPB/TE/tlp

BURR & BROWN
P.O. Box 7068
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191
Telephone: (315) 233-8300
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320